arXiv:1606.06783v1 [math.DS] 21 Jun 2016

# ON THE UNIQUENESS OF AN ERGODIC MEASURE OF FULL DIMENSION FOR NON-CONFORMAL REPELLERS

NUNO LUZIA

Abstract. We give a subclass $\mathcal{L}$ of *Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets* and an open set $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{L}$ such that any carpet in $\mathcal{U}$ has a unique ergodic measure of full dimension. In particular, any Lalley-Gatzouras carpet which is close to a *non-trivial* general Sierpinski carpet has a unique ergodic measure of full dimension.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets 2
2.1. Definition 2
2.2. Hausdorff dimension 3
3. Properties of measures of maximal dimension 5
3.1. Characterization of measures of maximal dimension 5
3.2. Relativized Ruelle's formulas 6
3.3. Criterium for uniqueness of measure of maximal dimension 10
4. Unique ergodic measure of full dimension 13
References 14

## 1. Introduction

It is well known that a $C^{1+\alpha}$ conformal repeller has a unique ergodic measure of full dimension. This is a consequence of Bowen's equation together with the classical thermodynamic formalism developed by Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen, see [14], [12], [3] and [13]. Moreover, this measure is a Gibbs state relative to some Hölder-continuous potential. Is this true for non-conformal repellers?

The simplest examples of non-conformal repellers are the *general Sierpinski carpets*, whose Hausdorff dimension was studied by Bedford [2] and McMullen [10]. They computed the Hausdorff dimension of these sets by establishing the variational principle for the dimension. As a consequence, these repellers have an ergodic measure of full dimension (in fact Bernoulli) and, by [11], this measure is *unique*.

In [6] Lalley and Gatzouras introduced a larger class of non-conformal repellers and computed their Hausdorff dimension also by establishing the variational principle for the dimension, and so these repellers have a Bernoulli measure of full dimension (see also [9] for a *random* version of this result). In [1] the authors give an example of a *Lalley-Gatzouras carpet* which has two Bernoulli measures of full dimension. So the answer to the question formulated above is negative.

In this paper, we study this problem – *existence* and *uniqueness* of an ergodic measure of full dimension – for a larger class of non-conformal repellers which we shall call *Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets*. As the name suggests, these repellers are the $C^{1+\alpha}$ non-linear versions of the Lalley-Gatzouras carpets. They are defined by an Iterated Function System $\{f_{ij}\}$ where $f_{ij}\colon [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]^2$, $i = 1,...,m$, $j = 1,...,m_i$ have the *skew-product* form $f_{ij}(x,y) = (a_{ij}(x,y), b_i(y))$, with the domination condition $0 < |\partial_x a_{ij}(x,y)| < |b_i'(y)| < 1$, and the corresponding attractor $\Lambda$ (see Section 2 for precise definitions). The Hausdorff dimension of these repellers was, essentially, computed in [7] by establishing the variational principle for the dimension. Because of the non-linearity of the transformations $f_{ij}$, the *existence* of an ergodic measure of full dimension turns out to be a non-trivial problem. This was proved to be true in [8] (in a more general context). Then we have the following.

**Theorem 1.** *A Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpet has an ergodic measure of full dimension. Moreover, this measure is a Gibbs state for a relativized variational principle.*

As we know now (by [1]), such a measure is, in general, not unique. The main purpose of this paper is to give sufficient conditions for having a *unique* ergodic measure of full dimension, based on an idea introduced in Remark 2 of [8].

We can introduce a natural topology on the class of Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets by saying that two of these carpets are close if the corresponding functions of the Iterated Function System are $C^{1+\alpha}$ close (with alphabet $(i,j)$ fixed). We denote by $\mathcal{L}$ the subclass of Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets for which $\partial_{xx} a_{ij} = 0$, i.e. $a_{ij}(x,y) = \tilde{a}_{ij}(y)x + u_{ij}(y)$. Of course, $\mathcal{L}$ contains the Lalley-Gatzouras carpets. In this paper, a *general Sierpinski carpet* is a Lalley-Gatzouras carpet for which $\partial_x a_{ij} = a$ and $b_i' = b$ for some positive constants $a$ and $b$ and every $(i,j)$ (this is a more general definition than usual). We say that such a carpet is *non-trivial* if $a < b$ and the natural numbers $m_i \geq 2$, $i = 1,...,m$ are not all equal to each other.

**Theorem 2.** *There is an open set $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{L}$ such that:*

*(i) $\mathcal{U}$ contains all non-trivial general Sierpinski carpets;*
*(ii) every reppeller $K$ in $\mathcal{U}$ has a unique ergodic measure of full dimension $\mu_K$;*
*(iii) the map $\mathcal{U} \ni K \mapsto \mu_K$ is continuous.*

We believe that Theorem 2 also holds in the class of Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets. The reason for restricting to the subclass $\mathcal{L}$ relies on the necessity of considering *basic potentials* in the relativized variational principle of [5], which we use, in order to have additional properties (see Remark 2).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the class of Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets and say how Theorem 1 follows from the works [7] and [8]. In Section 3, within the more general context of [8], we prove some properties of *measures of maximal dimension*, a relativized version of Ruelle's formulas for the derivative of the pressure, and a criterium for uniqueness of a measure of maximal dimension (Theorem 5). In Section 4 we use this criterium to prove Theorem 2.

## 2. Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets

2.1. **Definition.** Let $g_i\colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$, $i = 1,...,m$ be $C^{1+\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$. We say that $\{g_1,...,g_m\}$ is a *Simple Function System* (SFS) if:

- $0 < |g_i'(x)| < 1$ for every $x \in [0,1]$;
- the sets $g_i([0,1])$, $i = 1, ..., m$ are pairwise disjoint.

Let $f_{ij}\colon [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]^2$, $i = 1, ..., m$, $j = 1, ..., m_i$ be $C^{1+\alpha}$ such that:

(H1) $f_{ij}(x,y) = (a_{ij}(x,y), b_i(y))$;
(H2) $\{b_1, ..., b_m\}$ is SFS;

for each $i \in \{1, ..., m\}$ and $y \in [0,1]$,

(H3) $\{a_{i1}(\cdot, y), ..., a_{im_i}(\cdot, y)\}$ is SFS;
(H4) $\max_{x\in[0,1]} |\partial_x a_{ij}(x,y)| < |b_i'(y)|$, $j = 1, ..., m_i$.

Then there is a unique nonempty compact set $\Lambda$ of $[0,1]^2$ such that

$$\Lambda = \bigcup_{(i,j)} f_{ij}(\Lambda).$$

We call the pair $(\{f_{ij}\}, \Lambda)$ a *Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpet*.

When $\partial_{xx} a_{ij} = 0$ we get the definition of a carpet in $\mathcal{L}$. When the functions $a_{ij}$ and $b_i$ are linear and $\partial_y a_{ij} = 0$, we get the definition of a *Lalley-Gatzouras carpet*, see [6] (where equality is allowed in (H4)). When, moreover, $\partial_x a_{ij} = a$ and $b_i' = b$ for some positive constants $a$ and $b$ and every $(i,j)$, we get the definition of a *general Sierpinski carpet*, see [2] and [10] (in fact, our definition is a little more general).

2.2. **Hausdorff dimension.** The Hausdorff dimension of Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets was, essentially, computed in [7] by establishing the variational principle for the dimension. In fact, the theorems in [7] are formulated in terms of a Dynamical System $f$ instead of an Iterated Function System $\{f_{ij}\}$, although in its proofs we mainly used the $f_{ij}$ approach. The relation between the two approaches is given by $f_{ij} = (f|R_{ij})^{-1}$ where $R_{ij}$ is an element of a Markov partition for $f$. Beside imposing a skew-product structure for $f$ (which translates to (H1)), we considered a $C^2$ perturbation of the 2-torus transformation $f_0(x,y) = (lx, my)$, where $l > m > 1$ are integers. The only reason for doing this is to inherit from the linear system a *domination condition* (which translates to (H4)) and a simple Markov partition (inducing a full shift) which is *smooth*. More precisely, the Markov partition is constructed using the invariant foliation by horizontal lines (due to the skew-product structure) and an invariant *smooth vertical* foliation, which exists because the vertical lines constitute a *normally expanding* invariant foliation for $f_0$. In the present setting, all we need to show is that the sets

$$R_{(i_1 j_1)(i_2 j_2)\dots(i_n j_n)} = f_{i_1 j_1} \circ f_{i_2 j_2} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_n j_n}([0,1]^2)$$

have *vertical boundaries* formed by $C^1$ curves with uniformly bounded *distortion* for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. But, as we shall see, this is a consequence of the domination condition (H4).

Let

$$\lambda = \max_{(x,y),(i,j)} \frac{|\partial_x a_{ij}(x,y)|}{|b_i'(y)|}$$

which is $< 1$ by (H4), and

$$C = (1-\lambda)^{-1} \max_{(x,y),(i,j)} \frac{|\partial_y a_{ij}(x,y)|}{|b_i'(y)|}.$$

We will see that each $f_{ij}$ transforms *vertical graphs* with *distortion* $\leq C$ into vertical graphs with distortion $\leq C$. Let $\mathcal{G}_F = \{(F(y), y) \colon y \in I\}$ with $|F'(y)| \leq C$ for all $y \in I$ (where $I$ is some subinterval of $[0,1]$). Then $f_{ij}(\mathcal{G}_F) = \mathcal{G}_G$ where

$$G(y) = a_{ij}(F(b_i^{-1}(y)), b_i^{-1}(y)), \quad y \in b_i(I).$$

We see that (with $z = b_i^{-1}(y)$ and $w = (F(z), z)$)

$$G'(y) = \partial_x a_{ij}(w) b_i'(z)^{-1} F'(z) + \partial_y a_{ij}(w) b_i'(z)^{-1},$$

so $|G'(y)| \leq \lambda C + |\partial_y a_{ij}(w) b_i'(z)^{-1}| \leq C$. Then, starting with the vertical graphs $\{0\} \times [0,1]$ and $\{1\} \times [0,1]$ and using induction on $n$, we get the desired property for the sets $R_{(i_1 j_1)(i_2 j_2)\ldots(i_n j_n)}$.

Then it follows from the proof of Theorem A in [7] that, there exists $A > 0$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} \Lambda = \dim_{\mathrm{H}} \Lambda_n \pm \frac{A}{n},$$

where $\Lambda_n$ is a Lalley-Gatzouras carpet defined using an appropriate linearization of the functions $f_{i_1 j_1} \circ f_{i_2 j_2} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_n j_n}$.

More precisely, given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the $n$-tuples $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, ..., i_n)$ and $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, ..., j_n)$, where $i_k \in \{1, .., m\}$, $j_k \in \{1, ..., m_{i_k}\}$, $k = 1, ..., n$, and write

$$b_{\mathbf{i}} = b_{i_1} \circ b_{i_2} \circ \cdots \circ b_{i_n}, \quad a_{\mathbf{ij}} = \pi_1(f_{i_1 j_1} \circ f_{i_2 j_2} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_n j_n}),$$

where $\pi_1(x, y) = x$. Note that, because of the skew-product structure,

$$b_{\mathbf{i}}'(y) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} b_{i_k}'(y_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_x a_{\mathbf{ij}}(x, y) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} \partial_x a_{i_k j_k}(z_k),$$

where $y_k = b_{i_{k+1}} \circ \cdots \circ b_{i_n}(y)$, $y_n = y$ and $z_k = f_{i_{k+1} j_{k+1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_n j_n}(x, y)$, $z_n = (x, y)$. Consider the numbers

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{ij},n} = \max_{(x,y) \in [0,1]^2} |\partial_x a_{\mathbf{ij}}(x, y)| \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{\mathbf{i},n} = \max_{y \in [0,1]} |b_{\mathbf{i}}'(y)|.$$

Let $\mathbf{p}^n = (p_{\mathbf{i}}^n)$ be a probability vector in $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$. We define

$$\lambda_n(\mathbf{p}^n) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{i}}^n \log p_{\mathbf{i}}^n}{\sum_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{i}}^n \log \beta_{\mathbf{i},n}},$$

and $t_n(\mathbf{p}^n)$ as being the unique real in $[0,1]$ satisfying

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{i}}^n \log \left( \sum_{\mathbf{j}} \alpha_{\mathbf{ij},n}^{t_n(\mathbf{p}^n)} \right) = 0.$$

Consider the Bernoulli measure $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^n}$ for the Iterated Function System $\{f_{i_1 j_1} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_n j_n}\}$ that assigns to each $R_{(i_1 j_1)\ldots(i_n j_n)}$ the weigth

$$p_{\mathbf{i}}^n \frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{ij},n}^{t_n(\mathbf{p}^n)}}{\sum_{\mathbf{j}'} \alpha_{\mathbf{ij}',n}^{t_n(\mathbf{p}^n)}}.$$

**Theorem 3** (Proof of Theorem A, [7])**.** *Let $(\{f_{ij}\}, \Lambda)$ be a Non-Linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpet. There exist constants $A, B > 0$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^n} = \lambda_n(\mathbf{p}^n) + t_n(\mathbf{p}^n) \pm \frac{B}{n},$$

*and*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} \Lambda = \sup_{\mathbf{p}^n} \{\lambda_n(\mathbf{p}^n) + t_n(\mathbf{p}^n)\} \pm \frac{A}{n}.$$

*Moreover,* $(\{f_{ij}\}, \Lambda) \mapsto \dim_{\mathrm{H}} \Lambda$ *is a continuous function in the class of Non-Linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets.*

**Remark 1.** The continuity of $(\{f_{ij}\}, \Lambda) \mapsto \dim_{\mathrm{H}} \Lambda$ follows from the Proof of Corollary A in [7]. In fact, there we used the $\mathrm{C}^2$ topology but it is clear that we can use the $\mathrm{C}^{1+\alpha}$ topology.

As a consequence, the *variational principle for dimension* holds, i.e. the Hausdorff dimension of $\Lambda$ is the supremum of the Hausdorff dimension of ergodic measures (with respect to $\{f_{ij}\}$) on $\Lambda$. In [8] we prove the *existence* of an ergodic measure of full dimension for $\Lambda$, which is a Gibbs state for a relativized variational principle. Thus we have Theorem 1.

## 3. Properties of measures of maximal dimension

The results given in this section hold in the more general context of [8]. We consider $(X, T)$ and $(Y, S)$ mixing subshifts of finite type such that $(Y, S)$ is a factor of $(X, T)$ with factor map $\pi\colon X \to Y$. Assume that each fibre $\pi^{-1}(y)$ has at least two points.

3.1. **Characterization of measures of maximal dimension.** We use the following notation: $\mathcal{M}(T)$ is the set of all $T$-invariant Borel probability measures on $X$; $h_\mu(T)$ is the metric entropy of $T$ with respect to $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(T)$.

Let $\varphi\colon X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi\colon Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be positive Hölder-continuous functions. We define

$$D(\mu) = \frac{h_{\mu\circ\pi^{-1}}(S)}{\int \psi \circ \pi \, d\mu} + \frac{h_\mu(T) - h_{\mu\circ\pi^{-1}}(S)}{\int \varphi \, d\mu},$$

and

$$D = \sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}(T)} D(\mu).$$

Note that if $\mu$ is ergodic then $D(\mu)$ might be interpretated as the Hausdorff dimension of the measure $\mu$ (see Remark 5 of [8]). We say that $\mu$ is a *measure of maximal dimension* if $D(\mu) = D$. In [8] we prove the existence of an ergodic measure of maximal dimension, and give a characterization of measures of maximal dimension that we shall describe now (for more details see this reference).

We use the following version of the *relativized variational principle* by [4] and [5]. Given an Hölder-continuous function $\phi\colon X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$, there exists a positive Hölder-continuous function $A_\phi\colon Y \to \mathbb{R}$ (not depending on $\nu$) such that

$$\sup_{\substack{\mu\in\mathcal{M}(T)\\ \mu\circ\pi^{-1}=\nu}} \left\{ h_\mu(T) - h_\nu(S) + \int_X \phi \, d\mu \right\} = \int_Y \log A_\phi \, d\nu. \tag{1}$$

Moreover, there is a unique measure $\mu$ for which the supremum in (1) is attained which we call the *relative equilibrium state* with respect to $\phi$ and $\nu$, and $\mu$ is ergodic if $\nu$ is ergodic.

Given $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$, there is a unique real $t(\nu) \geq 0$ such that

$$\int_Y \log A_{-t(\nu)\varphi} \, d\nu = 0.$$

Then it easy to see that

$$D = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)} \left\{ \frac{h_\nu(S)}{\int \psi \, d\nu} + t(\nu) \right\}. \tag{2}$$

Let

$$\underline{t} = \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)} t(\nu) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{t} = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)} t(\nu).$$

Throughout this paper we assume $D$ and $\overline{t}$ are uniformly bounded (with respect to $\psi$ and $\varphi$), since in applications these numbers have dimension interpretations. We assume the following technical condition:
(H)
the supremum in (2) is not attained at an ergodic measure $\nu$ with $t(\nu) = \underline{t}$ or $\overline{t}$.

Let $P(\cdot)$ denote the classical Pressure function with respect to $(Y, S)$, and let $\nu_g$ denote the corresponding Gibbs state with respect to the Hölder-continuous potential $g\colon Y \to \mathbb{R}$. Given $t \in (\underline{t}, \overline{t})$, let

$$\Phi_t = (t - D)\psi + \beta(t) \log A_{-t\varphi} \tag{3}$$

where $\beta(t)$ is the unique real satisfying

$$\int \log A_{-t\varphi} \, d\nu_{\Phi_t} = 0$$

(see [8] for details). Finally, let $\mu_{\Phi_t}$ be the relative equilibrium state with respect to $-t\varphi$ and $\nu_{\Phi_t}$. The following result follows from the proof of Theorem A and Remark 3 in [8].

**Theorem 4** (Proof of Theorem A, [8])**.** *Assume (H). Then $D(\mu) = D$ if and only if $\mu = \mu_{\Phi_t}$ and $P(\Phi_t) = 0$ (the maximum value).*

3.2. **Relativized Ruelle's formulas.** We begin by recalling some classical Ruelle's formulas for the derivative of the pressure.

Let $Z = X$ or $Y$. Given $C > 0$ and $0 < \theta \leq 1$, let $\mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Z)$ denote the space of Hölder-continuous functions $\phi\colon Z \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$|\phi(z_1) - \phi(z_2)| \leq C d(z_1, z_2)^\theta, \text{ for all } z_1, z_2 \in Z, \tag{4}$$

and let

$$||\phi||_\theta = \inf\{C > 0\colon (4) \text{ holds}\}.$$

$\mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Z)$ becomes a Banach space with the norm $|||\phi|||_\theta = \max(||\phi||, ||\phi||_\theta)$, where $||.||$ is the uniform norm.

Let $\phi_t\colon Z \to \mathbb{R}$ be a one-parameter family of continuous functions. We say that $t \mapsto \phi_t$ is *differentiable* if its partial derivative in $t$ exists, let us call it $\dot{\phi}_t$ or $\frac{d}{dt}\phi_t$, and it is a one-parameter family of continuous functions.

Then the following result follows from [13].

**Proposition 1** (Ruelle [13])**.** *If $\phi_t \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)$ (with $C, \theta$ independent of $t$), $t \mapsto \phi_t$ is differentiable and $\dot{\phi}_t \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)$ then*

$$\frac{dP(\phi_t)}{dt} = \int \dot{\phi}_t \, d\nu_{\phi_t}.$$

*If, moreover, $h \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)$ then*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int h \, d\nu_{\phi_t} = Q_{\phi_t}(\dot{\phi}_t, h),$$

*where* $Q_{\phi_t}(\cdot,\cdot)\colon \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)\times\mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)\to\mathbb{R}$ *is given by*

$$Q_{\phi_t}(h_1,h_2)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\int_Y (h_1\circ S^n)\,h_2\,d\nu_{\phi_t}-\int_Y h_1\,d\nu_{\phi_t}\int_Y h_2\,d\nu_{\phi_t}\right).$$

*There exists a constant* $B>0$ *(depending only on* $C$ *and* $\theta$*) such that*

$$|Q_{\phi_t}(h_1,h_2)|\le B||h_1||_\theta\,||h_2||_\theta.$$

*Also, for each* $h_1,h_2\in\mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)$*,*

$$\mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)\ni\phi\mapsto Q_\phi(h_1,h_2)$$

*is a continuous function.*

Now we recall some definitions from [4] and [5] that are used to define $A_\phi$, for $\phi\in\mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(X)$. Given $y\in Y$, let $C_y$ denote the space of bounded continuous functions $f\colon\pi^{-1}(y)\to\mathbb{R}$. For each $y\in Y$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$, define the operators $G_y^{(n)}$ and $P_y^{(n)}\colon C_y\to C_y$ by

$$(G_y^{(n)}f)(x):=\sum_{\substack{T^n(x')=T^n(x)\\ \pi(x')=y}}\exp\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\phi(T^k(x'))\right)f(x'),\tag{5}$$

and

$$(P_y^{(n)}f)(x):=\frac{(G_y^{(n)}f)(x)}{(G_y^{(n)}\mathbf{1})(x)}.$$

Then (see Proposition 2.5 of [5]),

$$A_\phi(y):=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{(G_y^{(n+1)}\mathbf{1})(x)}{(G_{S(y)}^{(n)}\mathbf{1})(T(x))},$$

uniformly in $y\in Y$, $x\in\pi^{-1}(y)$. Moreover (see Corollary 4.14, Remark 4.16 and Proposition 5.5 of [4]), the rate of convergence is exponential depending only in $C$ and $\theta$. Also, for any $y\in Y$, the operators $P_y^{(n)}$ converge to a conditional expectation operator $P_y$ which gives a probability measure $\mu_y$ in $\pi^{-1}(y)$, in the sense that

$$(P_yf)(x)=\int f\,d\mu_y,\quad\text{for any } x\in\pi^{-1}(y).$$

The system $\{\mu_y\colon y\in Y\}$ is called a *Gibbs family* for $\phi$.

We will use the following property of $A_\phi$. Given $y\in Y$, consider the operators $V_y\colon C_y\to C_{S(y)}$ and $U_y\colon C_{S(y)}\to C_y$ given by

$$(V_yf)(x):=\sum_{\substack{x'\in T^{-1}(x)\\ \pi(x')=y}}\exp\left(\phi(x')\right)f(x'),$$

and

$$(U_yf)(x):=f(T(x)).$$

Then (see Proposition 5.5 of [4])

$$A_\phi(y)P_y=U_yP_{S(y)}V_y.\tag{6}$$

(Note that the operators $G_y^{(n)}$, $P_y^{(n)}$, $P_y$ and $V_y$ depend on the potential $\phi$.)

We say that $\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(X)$ is a *basic potential* (see Definition 4.1 of [5]), if for $y \in Y$ and $x \in \pi^{-1}(S(y))$ we have

$$A_\phi(y) = (V_y \mathbf{1})(x), \tag{7}$$

i.e., for each $y \in Y$, the function $V_y\mathbf{1}$ is constant. In this case we have the following.

**Proposition 2** ([5])**.** *If $\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(X)$ is a basic potential then:*

*(a) the Gibbs family for $\phi$ is* covariant*, i.e.*

$$\mu_y \circ T^{-1} = \mu_{S(y)}$$

*for each $y \in Y$;*

*(b) the relative equilibrium state for (1) with respect to $\phi$ and $\nu$ is given by $\mu = \mu_y \times \nu$;*

Now we are ready to prove the following.

**Proposition 3.** *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(X)$ and assume $-t\varphi$ is a basic potential for $t \in (\underline{t}, \overline{t})$. Then $t \mapsto A_{-t\varphi}$ is differentiable and*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi} = -\int \varphi \, d\mu_{t,y}, \tag{8}$$

*where $\{\mu_{t,y}\}$ is the Gibbs family for $-t\varphi$. Moreover, $\frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}^{D_\theta C, \eta(\theta)}(Y)$, for some $D_\theta > 0$ and $\eta(\theta) \in (0,1]$, $t \mapsto \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi}$ is differentiable and*

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \log A_{-t\varphi} = \int \varphi^2 \, d\mu_{t,y} - \left( \int \varphi \, d\mu_{t,y} \right)^2. \tag{9}$$

*Proof.* The differentiability of $t \mapsto A_{-t\varphi}$ is an immediate consequence of (7), and

$$\frac{d}{dt} A_{-t\varphi}(y) = -(V_{t,y}\varphi)(x), \quad y \in Y,\, x \in \pi^{-1}(S(y)) \tag{10}$$

(where $V_{t,y}$ is $V_y$ with the potential $\phi = -t\varphi$). In particulary, $(V_{t,y}\varphi)(x)$ does not depend on $x \in \pi^{-1}(S(y))$. Then applying (6) to $\varphi$ we get

$$A_{-t\varphi}(y) P_{t,y}\varphi = V_{t,y}\varphi,$$

which together with (10) gives (8). The Hölder-continuity of $\frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi}$ follows from Theorem 2.10 of [4].

In the same way, by (10) we see that $t \mapsto \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi}$ is differentiable and

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} A_{-t\varphi}(y) = (V_{t,y}\varphi^2)(x), \quad y \in Y,\, x \in \pi^{-1}(S(y)),$$

and, by (6) applied to $\varphi^2$,

$$A_{-t\varphi}(y) P_{t,y}\varphi^2 = V_{t,y}\varphi^2,$$

so that

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} A_{-t\varphi}(y) = A_{-t\varphi}(y) P_{t,y}\varphi^2.$$

Since

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \log A_{-t\varphi}(y) = \frac{1}{A_{-t\varphi}(y)} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} A_{-t\varphi}(y) - \left( \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi}(y) \right)^2,$$

we get (9). □

Recall the definition of $\Phi_t$ from (3).

**Proposition 4.** *Assume $-t\varphi$ is a basic potential for $t \in (\underline{t}, \overline{t})$. Then $t \mapsto \Phi_t$ is differentiable and*

$$\frac{dP(\Phi_t)}{dt} = \int \psi \, d\nu_{\Phi_t} - \beta(t) \int \varphi \, d\mu_{\Phi_t}. \tag{11}$$

*Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2P(\Phi_t)}{dt^2} = -\beta'(t) \int \varphi \, d\mu_{\Phi_t} \, + \, \beta(t) \int \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \log A_{-t\varphi} \, d\nu_{\Phi_t} \\ + \, Q_{\Phi_t}(\psi, \dot{\Phi}_t) \, + \, \beta(t) \, Q_{\Phi_t} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi}, \dot{\Phi}_t \right). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

*Proof.* Let $\psi, \varphi \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Z)$, where $Z = Y$ or $X$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarly small. It follows from Theorem 2.10 of [4] (see also Proposition 2 of [8]) that $A_{t\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}^{D_1,\eta}(Y)$, for some constants $D_1 = D_1(C, \theta) > 0$ and $\eta = \eta(\theta) > 0$, for every $t \in [\underline{t}, \overline{t}]$. Of course, we may assume $\eta \leq \theta$. It is also proved in [8] that $\beta(t)$ is continuous for $t \in [\underline{t} + \varepsilon, \overline{t} - \varepsilon]$. So, by (3), we have $\Phi_t \in \mathcal{H}^{D_2,\eta}(Y)$, for some constant $D_2 = D_2(C, \theta, \varepsilon)$, for every $t \in [\underline{t} + \varepsilon, \overline{t} - \varepsilon]$.

Let us see that $\beta(t)$ is $C^1$ for $t \in (\underline{t}, \overline{t})$. Let

$$F(t, \beta) = \int \log A_{-t\varphi} \, d\nu_{(t,\beta)},$$

where $\nu_{(t,\beta)}$ is the Gibbs sate for the potential $\phi_{(t,\beta)} = (t - D)\psi + \beta \log A_{-t\varphi}$. By Propositions 1 and 3,

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \beta}(t, \beta) = Q_{\phi_{(t,\beta)}}(\log A_{-t\varphi}, \log A_{-t\varphi}) \tag{13}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(t, \beta) = \int \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi} \, d\nu_{(t,\beta)} + Q_{\phi_{(t,\beta)}} \left( \log A_{-t\varphi}, \psi + \beta \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi} \right), \tag{14}$$

and so, by [13], $F$ is $C^1$. By [8], $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \beta}(t, \beta) > 0$ and $\beta(t)$ is well defined as the unique solution of $F(t, \beta(t)) = 0$. Then, it follows by the implicit function theorem that $\beta(t)$ is $C^1$ and

$$\beta'(t) = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(t, \beta(t)) \, / \, \frac{\partial F}{\partial \beta}(t, \beta(t)). \tag{15}$$

Then $t \mapsto \Phi_t$ is differentiable,

$$\dot{\Phi}_t = \psi + \beta'(t) \log A_{-t\varphi} + \beta(t) \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}^{D_2,\eta}(Y) \tag{16}$$

for every $t \in [\underline{t} + \varepsilon, \overline{t} - \varepsilon]$ (after, eventually, increasing $D_2$ and decreasing $\eta$), and applying Proposition 1 we get

$$\frac{dP(\Phi_t)}{dt} = \int \psi \, d\nu_{\Phi_t} + \beta(t) \int \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi} \, d\nu_{\Phi_t}. \tag{17}$$

This together with (8) and Proposition 2 gives (11). In the same way, (12) follows by applying Proposition 1 to (17). □

Let

$$\rho(t) = \frac{\int \psi \, d\nu_{\Phi_t}}{\int \varphi \, d\mu_{\Phi_t}}.$$

**Proposition 5.** *Assume (H) and $-t\varphi$ is a basic potential for $t \in (\underline{t}, \overline{t})$. If $D(\mu) = D$ then $\mu = \mu_{\Phi_t}$ and $\beta(t) = \rho(t)$.*

*Proof.* From Theorem 4 we have that $\mu = \mu_{\Phi_t}$ and $\frac{dP(\Phi_t)}{dt} = 0$. Then it follows from Proposition 4 that $\beta(t) = \rho(t)$. □

3.3. **Criterium for uniqueness of measure of maximal dimension.** Now we give sufficient conditions for having $\frac{d^2P(\Phi_t)}{dt^2} < 0$ which, by Theorem 4, implies the existence of a *unique* measure of maximal dimension (the existence follows from Theorem A in [8]), as already noticed in Remark 3 in [8].

We will need a *uniform version* of Hypothesis (H). Given $\varepsilon > 0$ let

($\mathrm{H}_\varepsilon$)

if the supremum in (2) is attained at an ergodic measure $\nu$ then $t(\nu) \in (\underline{t} + \varepsilon, \overline{t} - \varepsilon)$.

**Theorem 5.** *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(X)$ be positive. Assume $-t\varphi$ is a basic potential for $t \in (\underline{t}, \overline{t})$. Assume ($\mathrm{H}_\varepsilon$) for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Take any $\gamma > 0$ such that*

*(i)* $\gamma^{-1} < \varphi < \gamma$;
*(ii)* $|\beta(t)| < \gamma, \quad t \in (\underline{t} + \varepsilon, \overline{t} - \varepsilon)$;
*(iii)* $|\beta'(t)| < \gamma, \quad t \in (\underline{t} + \varepsilon, \overline{t} - \varepsilon)$.

*Then there exists a constant $\delta = \delta(C, \theta, \varepsilon, \gamma) > 0$ such that, if $||\psi||_\theta < \delta$ and $||\varphi||_\theta < \delta$, then there is a unique measure of maximal dimension, say $\mu_{\psi,\varphi}$, which is ergodic (a Gibbs state for a relativized variational principle).*

*Moreover, hypotheses ($\mathrm{H}_\varepsilon$) and (i)-(iii) are* robust *in the following sense: if $\tilde{\psi} \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(Y)$, $\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}^{C,\theta}(X)$ are positive, $-t\tilde{\varphi}$ is a basic potential and $\tilde{\psi}$, $\tilde{\varphi}$ are $|||.|||_\theta$-close to, respectively, $\psi$, $\varphi$ satisfying these hypotheses, then $\tilde{\psi}$, $\tilde{\varphi}$ also satisfy these hypotheses. Then we have that $(\psi, \varphi) \mapsto \mu_{\psi,\varphi}$ is continuous.*

*Proof. Unicity of $\mu_{\psi,\varphi}$.*

It follows from the Proof of Theorem A in [8] (see also Remark 3 in [8]) that maximizing measures are of the form $\mu_{\Phi_t}$ where $P(\Phi_t) = \frac{dP(\Phi_t)}{dt} = 0$ for some $t \in (\underline{t}+\varepsilon, \overline{t}-\varepsilon)$. Therefore, we only need to prove that $\frac{d^2P(\Phi_t)}{dt^2} < 0$ for $t \in (\underline{t}+\varepsilon, \overline{t}-\varepsilon)$, and this will be done estimating the 4 terms in (12).

*Term 1.* By (13), (14), (15), (8) and Proposition 2 (b), we have

$$\beta'(t) = \frac{\int \varphi \, d\mu_{\Phi_t} - Q_{\Phi_t}\left(\log A_{-t\varphi}, \psi + \beta \frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi}\right)}{Q_{\Phi_t}(\log A_{-t\varphi}, \log A_{-t\varphi})}. \tag{18}$$

Of course, $\int \varphi \, d\mu_{\Phi_t} > \gamma^{-1}$. It follows from [8] that $\log A_{-t\varphi}$ is not *cohomologous to a constant* and so $Q_{\Phi_t}(\log A_{-t\varphi}, \log A_{-t\varphi}) > 0$. It follows from Theorem 2.10 of [4] (see also Proposition 2 of [8]) that $\log A_{t\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}^{D_1||\varphi||_\theta, \eta}(Y)$, for some constants $D_1 = D_1(\theta, \varepsilon, \gamma) > 0$ and $\eta = \eta(\theta) > 0$ (we put the dependence on $\varepsilon$ because $\gamma$ depends on $\varepsilon$). Of course, we may assume $\eta \leq \theta$. In the same way, by (3), we see that $\Phi_t \in \mathcal{H}^{D_2, \eta}(Y)$, for some constant $D_2 = D_2(C, \theta, \varepsilon, \gamma) > 0$. So we may apply Proposition 1 to obtain

$$Q_{\Phi_t}(\log A_{-t\varphi}, \log A_{-t\varphi}) \leq D_2 ||\varphi||_\theta^2$$

(after, eventually, increasing $D_2$; we will do this a finite number of times). In the same way, see Proposition 3, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \log A_{-t\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}^{D_1||\varphi||_\theta, \eta}(Y), \tag{19}$$

and, applying Proposition 1 again, we get

$$\left| Q_{\Phi_t}\left(\log A_{-t\varphi}, \psi + \beta \frac{d}{dt}\log A_{-t\varphi}\right)\right| \leq D_2||\varphi||_\theta.$$

Putting all these together in (18), we get

$$-\beta'(t)\int \varphi\, d\mu_{\Phi_t} \leq -\frac{\gamma^{-2} - D_2||\varphi||_\theta}{D_2||\varphi||_\theta^2}, \tag{20}$$

if $||\varphi||_\theta < \gamma^{-2}D_2^{-1}$.

*Term 2.* Remember from (9),

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\log A_{-t\varphi} = \int \varphi^2\, d\mu_{t,y} - \left(\int \varphi\, d\mu_{t,y}\right)^2 \geq 0,$$

by Cauchy-Shwarz inequality. Clearly,

$$\int \varphi^2\, d\mu_{t,y} - \left(\int \varphi\, d\mu_{t,y}\right)^2 \leq (\sup\varphi)^2 - (\inf\varphi)^2 \leq 2\gamma\left(\sup\varphi - \inf\varphi\right),$$

and $\sup\varphi - \inf\varphi \leq \max\{1, \mathrm{diam}(X)\}||\varphi||_\theta$. So,

$$\left|\beta(t)\int \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\log A_{-t\varphi}\, d\nu_{\Phi_t}\right| \leq C_0\gamma^2||\varphi||_\theta,$$

for some constant $C_0$.

*Term 3.* It follows from (16) and reasoning as in *Term 1* that $\dot\Phi_t \in \mathcal{H}^{D_2,\eta}(Y)$. So, applying Proposition 1 we get

$$\left|Q_{\Phi_t}(\psi, \dot\Phi_t)\right| \leq D_2||\psi||_\theta.$$

*Term 4.* It follows from (19) and Proposition 1 that

$$\left|\beta(t)\, Q_{\Phi_t}\left(\frac{d}{dt}\log A_{-t\varphi}, \dot\Phi_t\right)\right| \leq \gamma D_2||\varphi||_\theta.$$

Finally, putting all 4 terms together gives

$$\frac{d^2P(\Phi_t)}{dt^2} \leq -\frac{\gamma^{-2} - D_2||\varphi||_\theta}{D_2||\varphi||_\theta^2} + C_0\gamma^2||\varphi||_\theta + D_2||\psi||_\theta + \gamma D_2||\varphi||_\theta < 0,$$

if we do $||\varphi||_\theta < \delta$, $||\psi||_\theta < \delta$ and $\delta = \delta(C, \theta, \varepsilon, \gamma) > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small.

*Robustness of hypotheses*

*Hyp. (i).* It is clear that hypothesis (i) is robust.

*Hyp. ($\mathrm{H}_\varepsilon$).* We see that $\varphi \mapsto t_\varphi(\nu)$ is continuous, uniformly in $\nu$. First, it is clear from (7) that

$$|\log A_{-t\tilde\varphi} - \log A_{-t\varphi}| \leq K||\tilde\varphi - \varphi||,$$

for some constant $K = K(\gamma) > 0$ (and $t$ varying in a fixed bounded interval). Then, by definition of $t_\varphi(\nu)$, by (8) and the above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int \log A_{-t_{\tilde\varphi}(\nu)\tilde\varphi}\, d\nu - \int \log A_{-t_\varphi(\nu)\varphi}\, d\nu \geq \\ &\left|\int \log A_{-t_{\tilde\varphi}(\nu)\varphi} - \log A_{-t_\varphi(\nu)\varphi}\, d\nu\right| - \left|\int \log A_{-t_{\tilde\varphi}(\nu)\tilde\varphi} - \log A_{-t_{\tilde\varphi}(\nu)\varphi}\, d\nu\right| \\ &\geq \gamma|t_{\tilde\varphi}(\nu) - t_\varphi(\nu)| - K(\gamma)||\tilde\varphi - \varphi||, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claimed. Since the functions $\varphi \mapsto t_\varphi(\nu)$ and $\psi \mapsto \int \psi\, d\nu$ appearing in (2) are continuous, uniformly in $\nu$, it follows that hypothesis ($\mathrm{H}_\varepsilon$) is robust.

*Hyp. (ii).* The proof that $(\varphi,\psi)\mapsto\beta_{\varphi,\psi}(t)$ is continuous, uniformly for $t$ in a compact interval, is essentially contained in [8]. In fact, let $t_0\in(\underline{t}_\varphi+\varepsilon,\overline{t}_\varphi-\varepsilon)$ and $\beta_0=\beta_{\varphi,\psi}(t_0)$. Then $F_{\varphi,\psi}(t_0,\beta_0)=0$ and, given $\eta>0$ sufficiently small, we have by (13) and continuity (see Proposition 1 of [8]) that there exists $\delta>0$ such that

$$F_{\tilde\varphi,\tilde\psi}(t,\beta_0-\eta)<0\quad\text{and}\quad F_{\tilde\varphi,\tilde\psi}(t,\beta_0+\eta)>0$$

for every $t\in(t_0-\delta,t_0+\delta)$, $||\tilde\varphi-\varphi||<\delta$ and $||\tilde\psi-\psi||<\delta$. So, by the intermediate value theorem, there is a unique $\tilde\beta_{\tilde\varphi,\tilde\psi}(t)\in(\beta_0-\eta,\beta_0+\eta)$ such that $F_{\tilde\varphi,\tilde\psi}(t,\tilde\beta_{\tilde\varphi,\tilde\psi}(t))=0$. By uniqueness, we have $\tilde\beta_{\tilde\varphi,\tilde\psi}(t)=\beta_{\tilde\varphi,\tilde\psi}(t)$ which implies the continuity of $(\varphi,\psi)\mapsto\beta_{\varphi,\psi}(t)$, uniformly for $t$ in a compact interval. Then it follows that hypothesis (ii) is robust.

*Hyp. (iii).* Now we see that $(\varphi,\psi)\mapsto\beta'_{\varphi,\psi}(t)$ is continuous, uniformly for $t$ in a compact interval. This will follow by (15) if we prove that the functions $(\varphi,\psi,t,\beta)\mapsto\frac{\partial F_{\varphi,\psi}}{\partial t}(t,\beta)$ and $\frac{\partial F_{\varphi,\psi}}{\partial\beta}(t,\beta)$ are continuous. From what has been said until now, it is clear that

$$\phi_{(\varphi,\psi,t,\beta)}=(t-D_{\varphi,\psi})\psi+\beta\log A_{-t\varphi}$$

is continuous. So the conclusion follows by (13), (14) and Proposition 1. Consequently, hypothesis (iii) is robust.

Therefore, if $\tilde\psi,\tilde\varphi$ are as described in statement of Theorem 5, there is a unique measure of full dimension $\mu_{\tilde\psi,\tilde\varphi}$, and we can infer about its continuity.

*Continuity of $\mu_{\psi,\varphi}$.*

Since

$$(t,\varphi,\psi)\mapsto\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi}=(t-D_{\varphi,\psi})\psi+\beta_{\varphi,\psi}(t)\log A_{-t\varphi}$$

is continuous, we get that $(t,\varphi,\psi)\mapsto\nu_{\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi}}$ is also continuous (see Proposition 1 of [8]). By Proposition 2 we have that

$$\mu_{\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi}}=\mu_{t,\varphi,y}\times\nu_{\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi}},$$

where $\{\mu_{t,\varphi,y}\}$ is the Gibbs family for $-t\varphi$. By Theorem 3.1 of [4], the Gibbs family $\{\mu_{t,\varphi,y}\}$ is equal to the family of conditional measures $\{\mu_y\}$, on the fibers $\pi^{-1}(y)$, for the measure $\mu$ which is the classical Gibbs sate with respect to the Hölder-continuous potential $-t\varphi-P(\log A_{-t\varphi})$. Then it follows that $(t,\varphi)\mapsto\mu_{t,\varphi,y}$ is continuous, uniformly in $y$, which implies the continuity of $(t,\varphi,\psi)\mapsto\mu_{\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi}}$.

Finally, $\mu_{\varphi,\psi}$ is the measure $\mu_{\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi}}$ where $t=t(\varphi,\psi)$ is the unique solution of $\frac{d}{dt}P(\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi})=0$ (see Theorem 4). Since $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}P(\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi})<0$ and $(\varphi,\psi)\mapsto\frac{d}{dt}P(\Phi_{t,\varphi,\psi})$ is continuous, uniformly for $t$ in a compact interval, we get that $t(\varphi,\psi)$ is continuous, and so is $\mu_{\varphi,\psi}$.

□

**Remark 2.** It follows from the proof of Theorem 5 that the unicity of measure of maximal dimension and the robustness of hypotheses (i.e., everything except, possibly, the continuity of the measure) would also hold *without the hypothesis of $-t\varphi$ being a basic potential*, if we could prove that, for some constant $C>0$,

$$\int-\frac{d}{dt}\log A_{-t\varphi}\,d\nu_{\Phi_t}\geq C^{-1}\min\varphi,$$
$$\left|\int\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\log A_{-t\varphi}\,d\nu_{\Phi_t}\right|\leq C||\varphi||_\theta.$$

In this case, Theorem 2 (except, possibly, the continuity of the measure) would hold in the class of Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets.

## 4. Unique ergodic measure of full dimension

In this section we prove Theorem 2.

Consider a non-trivial Sierpinski carpet. More precisely, consider the alphabet $\mathcal{I} = \{(i,j)\colon i \in \{1,...,m\} \text{ and } j \in \{1,...,m_i\}\}$ where $m$ and $m_i \geq 2$ are natural numbers such that $m_i$ are not all equal to each other. For $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}$, let

$$f^{\circ}_{ij}(x,y) = (ax + u_{ij}, by + v_i),$$

where $0 < a < b < 1$ and the positive numbers $v_i$ and $u_{ij}$ satisfy $b + v_i < v_{i+1}$, $a + u_{ij} < u_{ij+1}$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}$, where $v_{m+1} = u_{im_i+1} = 1$. Let $\Lambda^{\circ}$ be the corresponding attractor, i.e.

$$\Lambda^{\circ} = \bigcup_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}} f^{\circ}_{ij}(\Lambda^{\circ}).$$

We will consider Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets $(f_{ij}, \Lambda)$,

$$f_{ij}(x,y) = (a_{ij}(x,y), b_i(y)), \quad (i,j) \in \mathcal{I}$$

which are close to $(f^{\circ}_{ij}, \Lambda^{\circ})$. Note that, since the alphabet $\mathcal{I}$ is fixed, all of these carpets are topologically modeled by the same Bernoulli shift $T\colon X \to X$, where $X = \mathcal{I}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $T((i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)...) = ((i_2,j_2)...)$, via the conjugacy $h\colon X \to \Lambda$ given by

$$h((i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)...) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} f_{i_1j_1} \circ f_{i_2j_2} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_nj_n}([0,1]^2).$$

Let $\pi\colon X \to Y$, where $Y = \{1,...,m\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\pi((i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)...) = (i_1i_2...)$. Then $\pi \circ T = S \circ \pi$, where $S\colon \{1,...,m\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{1,...,m\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is the Bernoulli shift given by $S(i_1i_2...) = (i_2...)$.

By [7] and [8], we have that

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} \Lambda = \sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}(T)} \left\{ \frac{h_{\mu\circ\pi^{-1}}(S)}{\int \psi \circ \pi \, d\mu} + \frac{h_{\mu}(T) - h_{\mu\circ\pi^{-1}}(S)}{\int \varphi \, d\mu} \right\},$$

and that the measures of maximal dimension, as defined in previous section, being ergodic coincide with the *ergodic measures of full dimension* (since the dimension of an ergodic measure is the expression between brackets in equation above). Here $\varphi\colon X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi\colon Y \to \mathbb{R}$ are the positive and Hölder-continuous functions given by

$$\varphi((i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)...) = -\log \partial_x a_{i_1j_1}(x,y), \quad \psi(i_1i_2...) = -\log b'_i(y),$$

where $(x,y) = h((i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)...)$. So we must see that we satisfy Theorem 5's hypotheses.

We note that $-t\varphi$ is a basic potential (remember the definition from (7)) if we restrict to the subclass of carpets $\mathcal{L}$, for then $\partial_x a_{i_1j_1}(x,y)$ does not depend on $x$.

For the general Sierpinski carpet, we have that

$$t(\nu) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i \log m_i}{\log a^{-1}},$$

where $p_i$ is the $\nu$-measure of the cylinder $\{(i_1 i_2 ...) \in Y \colon i_1 = i\}$. Then, (2) reads

$$D = \frac{1}{\log b^{-1}} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)} \left\{ h_\nu(S) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i \log m_i^\rho \right\},$$

where $\rho = \frac{\log b}{\log a}$. It is well known that this supremum is attained at a Bernoulli measure $\nu$ with all $p_i > 0$. Since the numbers $m_i$ are not all equal to each other, it follows that $\underline{t} < t(\nu) < \overline{t}$. Hence we satisfy hypothesis ($\mathrm{H}_\varepsilon$), for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Also note that $||\varphi^\circ||_\alpha = ||\psi^\circ||_\alpha = 0$.

Then, Theorem 2 follows from applying Theorem 5 to carpets in $\mathcal{L}$ which are $C^{1+\alpha}$ close to a non-trivial general Sierpinski carpet.

## References


[1] J. Barral, D.-J. Feng, Non-uniqueness of ergodic measures with full Hausdorff dimension on Gatzouras-Lalley carpet, *Nonlinearity* **24** (2011), 2563-2567.

[2] T. Bedford, Crinkly curves, Markov partitions and box dimension of self similar sets, *PhD Thesis*, University of Warwick, 1984.

[3] R. Bowen, Hausdorff dimension of quasi-circles, *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **50** (1979), 11-26.

[4] M. Denker and M. Gordin. Gibbs measures for fibred systems. *Adv. Math.* **148** (1999), 161-192.

[5] M. Denker, M. Gordin and S. Heinemann. On the relative variational principle for fibred expanding maps. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **22** (2002), 757-782.

[6] D. Gatzouras and P. Lalley, Hausdorff and box dimensions of certain self-affine fractals, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **41** (1992), 533-568.

[7] N. Luzia, A variational principle for the dimension for a class of non-conformal repellers, *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **26** (2006), 821-845.

[8] N. Luzia, Measure of full dimension for a class of nonconformal repellers, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **26** (2010), 291-302.

[9] N. Luzia, Hausdorff dimension of certain random self-affine fractals, *Stoch. Dyn.* **11** (2011), 627-642.

[10] C. McMullen, The Hausdorff dimension of general Sierpiński carpets, *Nagoya Math. J.* **96** (1984), 1-9.

[11] E. Olivier, Uniqueness of the measure with full dimension on sofic affine-invariant subsets of the 2-torus, *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **30** (2010), 1503-1528.

[12] D. Ruelle, Repellers for real analytic maps. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **2** (1982), 99-107.

[13] D. Ruelle, *Thermodynamic Formalism*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[14] Ya. Sinai, Gibbs measures in ergodic theory, *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* **27** (1972), 21-64. English translation: *Russian Math. Surveys* **27** (1972), 21-69.